

REMARKS

Claims 1-31 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 6, 7 and 8 have been amended. Claims 9 and 11-31 have been canceled without prejudice. It is respectfully submitted that no new matter has been added.

Claim Rejections 35 USC § 102:

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejections of claims 1-5 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,850,298 to Fujimori et al. ("Fujimori").

Applicant respectfully submits that Fujimori does not disclose or suggest a first portion of a color filter overlapping a light-blocking member, as recited in amended claim 1. Therefore, claim 1 is not anticipated by Fujimori. In addition, for at least the reason that claims 4-5 and 10 depend from claim 1, and claims 4-5 and 10 are also not anticipated by the cited reference.

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, a first portion of a color filter overlapping a light-blocking member.

Fujimori is directed to a transfective liquid crystal display having a transparent dielectric layer and a color filter in a reflective region. However, Fujimori does not disclose or suggest a portion of the color filter overlapping a light-blocking member. Referring to Fig. 19 of Fujimori, a light-blocking member is not disclosed.

Accordingly, Fujimori does not disclose a first portion of a color filter overlapping a light-blocking member. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-5 and 10 are not anticipated by Fujimori.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 1-5 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejections of claims 1 and 6-9 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0160918 to Rho (“Rho ‘918”).

Applicant notes that Examiner uses Rho ‘918 as a 102(e) reference against the presently claimed invention. Rho ‘918 is not “an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another”. Section 102(e) states that “a person shall be entitled to a patent unless the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent”. Like the instant application, Rho ‘918 lists Soo-Guy Rho as the sole inventor. Accordingly, Rho ‘918 is not an application for patent “by another” as required by 102(e).

Therefore, Applicant submits that because Rho ‘918 is not an application for patent “by another”, Rho ‘918 cannot be used as a reference under section 102(e).

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1 and 6-8 are not anticipated by Rho ‘918, claim 9 having been canceled.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 1 and 6-9 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

An early and favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited. If the Examiner has any further questions or comments, the Examiner may telephone Applicant's Attorney to reach a prompt disposition of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "Michael F. Morano", is written over a horizontal line.

Jagwoo Park
Ltd. Rec. No. L0302

Michael F. Morano
Reg. No. 44,952
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

F. Chau & Associates, LLC
130 Woodbury Road
Woodbury, New York 11797
TEL: (516) 692-8888
FAX: (516) 692-8889